

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 634

RC 003 903

AUTHOR Nix, Harold L.
TITLE Opportunities for and Limitations of Social and Economic Adjustments in an Alabama Rural County.
INSTITUTION Auburn Univ., Ala. Agricultural Experiment Station.
REPORT NO Bull-338
PUB DATE Jan 62
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.45
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment Problems, Depressed Areas (Geographic), *Economic Disadvantage, Heads of Households, Housewives, Living Standards, Low Income Groups, Research, *Rural Environment, *Self Actualization, Self Concept, *Social Problems, Social Responsibility, Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS *Alabama, Fayette County

ABSTRACT

The plights of southern farmers and the self-perceptions of their problems are the main topics of this study. Using U. S. Department of Agriculture criteria for determining low income and low level of living for rural areas, Fayette County, Alabama, was selected for this pilot study. Some 171 rural farm and nonfarm households, randomly selected, comprise the source of data for the study. In the body of the document is a section on characteristics of sample families in the areas of (1) social and economic adjustments, (2) consequences of degree of social and economic adjustment, and (3) mechanisms of adjustment. A summary and conclusions on the foregoing factors are given. The appendices include statistical data and a list of 7 suggested guidelines for dealing with the problems that were uncovered. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

BULLETIN 339
JANUARY 1962



opportunities for and limitations of
SOCIAL and
ECONOMIC
ADJUSTMENTS
in an Alabama rural county

RC003903

 Agricultural Experiment Station
AUBURN UNIVERSITY
E. V. Smith, Director Auburn, Alabama

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION.....	3
Scope, Method, and Objectives.....	5
DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA.....	6
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE FAMILIES.....	9
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS.....	10
Occupation.....	10
Income Level of Family.....	12
Level of Living.....	16
Community Participation.....	17
CONSEQUENCES OF DEGREE OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT.....	18
Readiness to Change Occupation.....	19
Readiness to Change Residence.....	19
Despair and Uncertainty.....	21
MECHANISMS OF ADJUSTMENT.....	24
Migration.....	24
Occupational Mobility.....	25
Homemaker's Employment.....	25
Residential Mobility.....	26
Welfare and Other Nonwork Income.....	26
Educational Mobility.....	26
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	27
Summary.....	27
Conclusions.....	31
APPENDIX A (TABLES).....	34
APPENDIX B.....	47
Guide Lines for Social and Economic Adjustments.....	47

ED034634

Opportunities for and Limitations of Social and Economic Adjustments in An Alabama Rural County*

HAROLD L. NIX, Assistant Rural Sociologist**

INTRODUCTION

DURING the first decade of the twentieth century, attention was focused on the widening gap between rural and urban levels of living. Consequently, various agricultural and educational programs were developed to aid rural people in attaining a level of living more nearly comparable with that of the urban population.

Many technological and scientific advances in American agriculture brought about a tremendous increase in output per man hour between 1920 and 1960.¹ This increase in efficiency did not occur on all farms, nor did it occur at the same rate on all farms that shared in increased efficiency. Thus, only those who were willing and able to expand and modernize their farming operations received major benefits from increased productivity, income, and levels of living. Those who were either unwilling or unable

* The research project on which this report is based was supported by funds provided by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and State research funds. Research was carried out under provisions of Alabama's project Ala-123, "Sociological Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals in Selected Low-Income Rural Areas of Alabama," a contributing study to the Southern Regional Rural Sociology Research Project S-44, "Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals in Low-Income Rural Areas of the South."

** Resigned. For assistance in this study, special acknowledgment is given to the families who provided the basic information on which the study is based and to the members of the Technical Committee of S-44 who critically reviewed and approved the design for and procedures used in the study.

¹ United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, *Agricultural Outlook Charts: 1959* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 65.

to make necessary changes and adjustments were faced with several alternatives. Among these were: (1) to continue farming by old standards and accept an increasingly lower comparative level of living; (2) to join the "great exodus" from the occupation of farming (this often meant leaving rural residences, when non-farm work was not available in the area); (3) to supplement farm income by off-farm employment for operators or other members of their families (for many aged and disabled people, the chances for occupational adjustment within or outside of agriculture were comparatively small); (4) to live off their economic reserves; and (5) for many aged and disabled persons, to become wards of their families or society.

A more than proportionate share of these latter groups of farmers was found in the South. The 1955 U.S. Department of Agriculture report to the President on "Development of Agriculture's Human Resources"² indicated that 1.5 million, or 28 per cent of the 5.4 million farm operators in the United States in 1950, had cash family incomes of less than \$1,000. Of these 1.5 million low-income farm operators, 77 per cent were in the South. In this same report, a delineation was made of the "low-income and low-level-of-living areas in agriculture." These areas were further divided into moderate, substantial, and serious low-income and low-level-of-living areas.

With respect to the findings of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's 1955 study, and the apparent acuteness of the problems of low income and low levels of living in the South, answers to two questions are of major concern: (1) Is this concentration of low-income rural people in certain geographic areas of the nation a problem to society? (2) Is this situation a problem to the people involved?

The American idea of equality of opportunity for each person — (1) to make his own occupational choice, (2) to receive at least a minimum income and standard of living, and (3) to participate democratically in the affairs of his community — is a real value in American society. Consequently, the low-income status of over a fourth of the country's rural population takes on the significance of a societal problem. This is true not only because it violates the ideal of "equality of opportunity," but also because

² United States Department of Agriculture, *Development of Agriculture's Human Resources: A Report on Problems of Low-Income Farmers* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 1.

of the under-utilization of human resources in expanding the national economy, in providing for the "proper" maintenance and training of succeeding generations, and for full participation of younger people in the wider society at maturity.

In terms of the American value system, the low-income situation in many rural areas of the South is often described as a societal problem. Research is needed, however, to determine the degree to which specific individuals in specific localities understand that this is a problem to them as individuals. This study was designed, in part, to help answer this question.

A societal problem, in terms of the dominant values of a society, may or may not be recognized as a problem by the individuals involved. This depends on the degree to which individuals have accepted the values of their greater society and their awareness of their success toward attaining these values in comparison with other segments of society.

Fayette County, Alabama, met all of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's criteria in 1955 for determining "low-income and low-level-of-living areas" and was classified as falling within the serious low-income category. This county was selected as a pilot study county for research activities in Alabama.

Social behavior may be described as an adjustive process whereby individuals with specific desires, capabilities, and attitudes adjust (1) in specific situations, (2) to their own desires and capabilities, and (3) to the expectations of the social groups to which they belong. The Fayette County study may be generally described as being within this general sociological approach.

Scope, Method, and Objectives

This study was based primarily on a random sample of 171 rural farm and nonfarm households in Fayette County, Alabama. The principal source of data was from personal interviews with both heads (usually husbands) and homemakers (wives) of these rural households. In addition to data from respondents, a limited amount of secondary data was used.

This study was concerned primarily with four types of social and economic adjustments: (1) occupation, (2) income, (3) level of living, and (4) community participation. The specific objectives of the study were:

- (1) To determine the achievements of the sample population

in the four types of adjustment, and to investigate the factors causing, or associated with, varying degrees of achievement;

(2) To determine the aspirations of the sample population in the four types of adjustment, and to view the similarities or differences between respondents' achievements and their aspirations;

(3) To determine, where achievements were short of aspirations, what respondents considered to be barriers or obstacles to achievement of their aspirations in the four types of adjustment;

(4) To determine the degree of satisfaction experienced by respondents to their achievements in specific types of adjustment;

(5) To determine some of the general consequences of achievement or lack of achievement of any or all of life's aspirations (some of these more general consequences of the total adjustment process were measured by readiness to change occupation, readiness to change residence, and despair and uncertainty); and

(6) To determine some of the mechanisms by which adjustments were made to discrepancies existing between achievements and aspirations of rural people.

DESCRIPTION of STUDY AREA

Fayette County, located in northwestern Alabama, is about 70 miles west of Birmingham and 40 miles north of Tuscaloosa. Two-thirds of the county lies within the Upper Coastal Plain farming area and the remainder within the Mineral and Industrial sections of the Sand Mountain farming area.

In 1960, total population of Fayette County was 16,148, Appendix Table 1. Of this number, 26 per cent were classified as urban and 74 per cent as rural. When compared with 1950 figures, the 1960 population represented a 17 per cent decline in total population and a 50 per cent decline in the rural farm segment. During the same period, urban population in the county seat, Fayette, increased 14 per cent, while rural nonfarm increased 32 per cent.

The proportion of nonwhites in the county remained relatively stable from 1940 to 1960. In 1960, the proportion of nonwhites in the county was 16 per cent, as compared with 30 per cent for the State. There was considerable variation in the proportion of nonwhites in the rural and urban segments of the county in 1960. Both rural farm and rural nonfarm populations

contained about 13 per cent nonwhites, while urban population was approximately 24 per cent nonwhites.

The median years of schooling completed by persons 25 years of age and older was 7.6 in 1950. This compared with a median of 7.9 for Alabama and 9.3 for the United States. During the same year, the median income for all families and unrelated individuals in Fayette County was \$944. This was only 60 per cent of the State median income of \$1,580.

Approximate land area in the county is 401,280 acres, of which about 64 per cent was reported in farms in 1950. This proportion declined to 48 per cent by 1960. A corresponding reduction took place in number of farms. The 48 per cent decline in number of farms was slightly greater than the 45 per cent decline for Alabama as a whole. As number of farms declined, average size increased from about 99 acres per farm in 1950 to 142 acres in 1960.

In 1950, commercial class farms selling \$5,000 or more of farm products made up 0.7 per cent of all farms in the county. By 1960, the proportion of farms in these classes had increased to 8 per cent. Meanwhile, commercial classes of farms selling less than \$5,000 worth of farm products declined from approximately 54 to 34 per cent of all farms. Proportion of part-time farms went from 25 per cent in 1950 to 58 per cent in 1960.³

An indication of recent changes in Fayette County agriculture has been the change in source of "value of all farm products sold." In 1940, all crops were the reported source of 69 per cent of the value of all farm products sold. This proportion declined to 53 per cent in 1955. On the other hand, the proportionate value of all livestock and livestock products increased from 25 per cent in 1940 to 41 per cent in 1955. Farm forest products sold accounted for 6 per cent of the total during both periods.

The recent decline in proportion of farm tenants indicates that tenant farmers and sharecroppers were more than proportionately represented in shifts out of farming. The proportion of tenants on farms in Fayette County declined from approximately 34 per cent in 1950 to 22 per cent in 1960.

An indication of the degree to which mechanization has progressed in the county was the proportion of farms reporting tractors. In 1950, only 14 per cent reported tractors. This proportion increased to 41 per cent by 1960. However, the degree

³ Excluding residential farms as reported by the 1950 Census.

of mechanization was probably greater than is indicated, because only about 42 per cent of the county's farms were reported as commercial farms in 1960.

The farm operator family level-of-living indexes for Fayette County for the years 1945, 1950, and 1954 were 36, 67, and 79. These levels were near the State levels but were only a third to a half of the United States levels, which were 100, 122, and 140 for the 3 years.

In 1940, the employed civilian labor force of Fayette County included 5,428 males and 870 females. By 1950, the male labor force had declined to 4,895, while the female labor force had increased to 1,153. During the former year, 735 males were reported employed in manufacturing. Of these, 510 were engaged in the manufacture of furniture, lumber, and wood products, while 130 worked in the manufacture of textile mill products. In 1956, 705 males of Fayette County were reported employed in manufacturing.⁴ Of these, 275 were engaged in the manufacture of furniture, lumber, and wood products and 334 were employed in textile mills.

Only 87 females of the employed civilian labor force of the county were reported employed in manufacturing in 1940. Of these, 74 worked in the textile industry. The Fayette County Industrial Development Board reported 470 females engaged in manufacturing in 1956, of which about 93 per cent were employed in the textile industry. This total number of females engaged in manufacturing represented an increase of approximately 540 per cent since 1940, while the male labor force employed in manufacturing declined 4 per cent.

A County Rural Development Committee was formally organized in Fayette County, Alabama, in December 1956. A principal objective of this Committee was to speed up many of the changes already taking place in the county by stimulating local initiative, expanding educational efforts, encouraging new developments, and obtaining more widespread adoption and use of those ideas, practices, and movements that had already proved successful in the county.⁵

⁴ The Fayette County Industrial Development Board in cooperation with the Alabama State Planning and Industrial Development Board, *The Industrial Potential of Fayette County, Alabama* (Montgomery: 1956), pp. 9-10.

⁵ Department of Agricultural Economics, *Opportunities for Rural Development in Fayette County, Alabama*, Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn University, June, 1958.

The Fayette County Rural Development Committee has been instrumental during recent years in encouraging the adoption of new farm enterprises, organizing cooperative marketing procedures, and assisting in encouraging industrial developments in the area. The 1959-60 annual report of the Committee revealed that there were three major organizations in the county actively engaged in industrial promotion within the county. These were the Fayette County Rural Development Industrial Subcommittee, the Fayette County Industrial Board, and the Fayette Chamber of Commerce.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS of SAMPLE FAMILIES

Since this study was confined to the rural population in Fayette County, Alabama, the town of Fayette with a 1960 population of 4,227 was not included in the sample area. The rural sample indicated that approximately 40 per cent of the rural population were rural farm residents and 60 per cent were rural nonfarm residents. Approximately 91 per cent of the heads of rural households interviewed were married males.

Heads of the rural households studied averaged 50 years of age. Twenty-three per cent were 65 or older. In a population of this age, the availability of heads of households for work was limited. About 25 per cent classified themselves as permanently disabled, and slightly over 10 per cent said they had limited permanent disabilities. Thus only about two-thirds were fully able to work.

Of the heads who were farmers or part-time farmers, 83 per cent were owners or part-owners. The remaining 17 per cent included tenants and sharecroppers.

The educational levels of the heads and homemakers of the rural families in the 1960 sample differed little from that reported in the 1950 Census of Population for the total rural population of Fayette County. For the husbands, average years of education completed was near 7.5. The average for the wives was about 8 years of schooling. Approximately 13 per cent of both heads and homemakers had completed 12 or more years of schooling. Of these, only 1 per cent of the heads and 4 per cent of the homemakers had attended college.

Average size of rural households in the sample was 3.3. This compares with 3.9 for rural households in the State at large in

1960. The smaller average family size of the sample households was associated with the high average age of the heads and the migration of youth from rural areas.

In summary, families in the sample population were all rural and almost all white with about two out of three in the nonfarm residential category. The heads of these families were relatively old, and had about the same educational level as rural adults in other sections of Alabama. Those who were farming were largely small owner-operators, Appendix Table 2.

SOCIAL and ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS

The primary concern of this study was with social and economic adjustments from the following points of view: (1) the objective *achievements* of respondents, (2) the *aspirations* of respondents, (3) the perceived *obstacles* to the achievement of aspirations, and (4) the *consequences* of the degree to which aspirations were achieved.

Occupation

An individual's work or job fulfills many needs other than those of an economic nature. Not only do occupations play a major role in assigning an occupant and his family a certain way of life and a place in the strata of his society, but the combined occupational structure of the peoples of a community or area largely determine the institutional structure of that community. In Fayette County, Alabama, there are many physical and behavioral indications that its communities, with their particular social and cultural patterns, were built on an agricultural way of life. However, there is also evidence that the occupational structure of the county is changing rapidly and is leaving in its wake the necessity for many new social and economic adjustments.

OCCUPATIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS. When surveyed in the spring of 1960, only 32 per cent of the heads of rural households reported farming to be their main occupation, Appendix Table 3. Although farming was still the largest single occupation in rural areas, it had declined considerably from former years. For example, approximately 75 and 61 per cent of the Fayette County rural employed male labor force reported farming as their major occupation for the years 1940 and 1950.

Only 24 per cent of the rural homemakers were employed outside of the home. Of this group, two-thirds were employed as semi-skilled workers. These were largely employed by textile plants located in the area. Roughly 37 per cent of the homemakers of families that received the majority of their income from nonfarm work sources were employed. Among families whose main source of income was from farm or nonwork sources, about 10 per cent of the homemakers were employed.

Although 32 per cent of the heads of rural households reported their main occupation as farming, only 14 per cent of these families received all of their income from farming. An even larger percentage (21 per cent) received all of their support from nonwork sources, which were basically welfare. Thirty-three per cent received all of their income from nonfarm work sources.

It was around a classification in terms of "major source of family income" that this study was basically organized. Appendix Table 4 indicates that roughly half of the sample families received more than half of their family income from nonfarm work sources, while the next largest proportion received most of their family income from nonwork sources. Only 18 per cent received a majority of their income from farming or from farm work.

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION. Almost two-thirds of the employable heads of rural households reported that they preferred their present type of work, Appendix Table 5. Of the three "major source of family income" groups, the farm group was more inclined to prefer its present work. Eleven per cent of the employable heads expressed a desire to change types of nonfarm work. Nine per cent wanted to change from farming to nonfarm work. Also, 9 per cent wished to change from nonfarm work to farming. Four per cent wanted to change from part-time farming to full-time farming.

The fact that two-thirds of the heads of rural households expressed preference for their present kind of work does not mean complete satisfaction either with work conditions or with the rewards for their labor. Such remarks as, "I might as well like it for I am too old to get into anything else," indicate that some responses were not personal preferences but were assessments or acknowledgments of individual capabilities and situations.

Of the heads of rural households who expressed a desire to change occupations, 69 per cent aspired to higher occupational levels, 12 per cent to occupations at about the same level as their present, and the remaining 19 per cent aspired to lower occupational levels.

When the heads of rural households who were not disabled or were not over 60 years of age were asked what they expected to be doing in 5 years, 69 per cent said that they expected to be employed in their present occupation, which was the occupation of their choice. An additional 18 per cent indicated that they would probably be engaged in the same work as at present, but this would not be their choice of occupations. Eight per cent thought that they would be able within 5 years to change to their choice of occupations, Appendix Table 6.

OBSTACLES TO OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS. The heads of rural households who believed that they would not be able to achieve their occupational aspirations within 5 years were asked what they felt would prevent this achievement. Age or health were indicated as barriers by 40 per cent, Appendix Table 7. Fifteen per cent offered each of the following obstacles: lack of job opportunities, lack of land or capital, and expected low incomes. Twelve per cent said that lack of training would prevent their occupational adjustment.

OCCUPATIONAL SATISFACTION. Although 95 per cent of the employed heads of rural households expressed a general liking for their work, all of this group suggested some specific dislike. The most common complaint involved low financial rewards for work and was named by more than half, Appendix Table 8. Eighty-four per cent of the heads whose major source of family income was from farming made this complaint. Other commonly mentioned dislikes involved the physical nature of work, distance to work, interpersonal relations, and long hours.

Income Level of Family

Income is often considered as a strictly economic or material value. However, research has shown that workers often may be less concerned with the quantity of their income *per se* than with what they make in comparison with others. When this is done, income becomes more than a means for the purchase of

desired goods and services. It becomes, in part, a symbol of prestige, or of the relative personal worth of the worker.

Beyond the income level necessary to meet basic needs, income increasingly becomes a relative value in which the receiver's satisfaction is determined largely by weighing the importance of his services and the amount of his income with those of his reference group. Fifty or a hundred years ago, the reference groups of a farmer in a "remote" rural area were made up largely of kinsmen and neighboring farmers. However, with increased and improved means of transportation and communication during recent years, as well as with out-migration of kinsmen, farmers' social horizons have broadened. The individual farmer's dissatisfaction with the comparatively low rewards of his labors has thus become greater as his ability to compare his situation with that of urban and rural nonfarm groups has increased. This dissatisfaction appears to be further intensified by the widespread feeling among farmers that their work in providing food and fiber for society as a whole is one of the most basic and important of all endeavors.

INCOME ACHIEVEMENT. In considering net cash family income levels of the rural families studied, it should be kept in mind that incomes of many families, especially in the farm group, are supplemented by certain prerequisites.

Responses indicated that 29 per cent of the rural families studied had less than \$1,000 in net cash income for the year 1959, Appendix Table 9. An additional 39 per cent reported net cash incomes of \$1,000-\$2,999, while about 32 per cent received \$3,000 or more. The median reported family income was \$1,676. The 10 per cent of larger farmers, businessmen, and professionals who made \$5,000 or more helped pull the average income of all families up to \$2,379.

A greater proportion of the farm group reported less than \$500 net cash income than did the "nonwork group." While 78 per cent of the farm families and 94 per cent of the nonwork families reported net cash incomes of less than \$2,000, 80 per cent of the nonfarm work families reported incomes of \$2,000 or more.

INCOME ASPIRATIONS. To evaluate the income aspirational level of heads of rural households, respondents were asked: "If

you had a job working the usual number of hours a week which enabled you to live comfortably, would you prefer to work (1) longer hours and make more money, (2) shorter hours and make less money, or (3) continue working the regular week as required?" For the nonwork group, this was largely an academic question since their age and disability in most cases would not allow their motivations, which probably grow largely out of the boredom of inactivity, to react to the alternatives. Roughly three-fourths of both the farm and nonfarm work groups preferred regular hours with regular pay; a sixth of the farm group and a fourth of the nonfarm work group appeared to have higher income aspirations by indicating a preference for longer hours and more pay, Appendix Table 10.

The same job preference alternatives in terms of number of hours and amount of pay were examined in terms of three income level groups — \$1 to \$999, \$1,000 to \$2,999, and \$3,000 and more, Appendix Table 11. There was little difference between the two lowest income groups. In these groups, approximately two-thirds expressed a preference for "regular hours and regular pay," and just under a third preferred "longer hours and more pay." The highest of the three income groups deviated widely from the two lower groups. Eighty per cent of the higher income group said they preferred "regular hours and regular pay," while 18 per cent indicated a preference for longer hours and more pay.

A second question was asked to acquire some understanding of the strength of the "push and pull" forces involved in the desire for more income and the attachment to the respondent's present work. With the exception of the professionals, factory workers, retired, and disabled, heads of rural households were asked which of three ways they would react to an offer of double their present earnings at a factory job working 8 hours a day. About half replied that they would accept such an offer at once. Roughly a third of the total group said that they would think it over and decide later, Appendix Table 12. Only 18 per cent indicated that they would refuse the offer. Neither the "farm" nor "nonfarm work" groups deviated widely from the group as a whole. Relatively few heads of households whose major source of income was from nonwork sources indicated that they were able to work. Members of this group gave more positive answers than in the other groups, having a greater percentage in both the "take it at once" and "refuse it" categories.

OBSTACLES TO INCOME ASPIRATIONS. The heads of rural households and rural homemakers who said that their family incomes were unsatisfactory were asked what they considered the main reason for their unsatisfactory incomes. According to the respondents whose major source of family income was farming, their major obstacles to a better income (in 1959) were the existing farm cost-price relationship, a relatively poor crop year, and their age or health, Appendix Table 13. Obstacles most often mentioned by the nonfarm work group were lack of jobs, age or health, and the low wage scale in the area. Age or health was given by more than half of the nonwork group as their chief barrier to a better income. The second most often mentioned obstacle of the nonwork group was "inadequate pension or retirement programs."

The heads of rural households who were not disabled, retired, or 65 years of age or above were asked if they were offered an opportunity to make half again as much as they were making, would certain specified conditions *stop* them from making the change. These conditions are given in Appendix Table 14, along with the proportion who said the stated conditions would prevent them from making the change for 50 per cent more income. Responses to the question reveal that hazards to health, separation from family, and excessive family mobility were among the more important barriers. Of special significance to those involved in programs of economic adjustment was the fact that 41 per cent did not indicate that having to leave their communities would stop them from accepting a 50 per cent increase in income. Of the three "major source of family income" groups, the farm group was most reluctant, the nonwork group was least reluctant, and the nonfarm work group was intermediate in this respect.

As indicated in Appendix Table 14, four of the five conditions least likely to stop respondents from accepting other work returning 50 per cent more income involved largely community bonds and relationships. On the other hand, the six conditions most likely to prevent acceptance of better paying employment largely involved the nature of the work and its relationship to the worker and his family. Increasingly, it appears that one's family, occupation, and special interest groups are the real focus of the individual's social interaction.

SATISFACTION WITH FAMILY INCOME LEVEL. Based on respondents' income aspirations, their degree of achievement of these aspirations, and their perceptions of obstacles to achievement of their aspirations, they received varying degrees of satisfactions. Only 1 per cent of heads of rural households, all in the nonfarm work group, indicated a "very satisfactory" level of income. Roughly two-thirds of the sample expressed "satisfaction" and about a third indicated an "unsatisfactory" level of income. Almost three-fourths of both the farm and nonfarm work groups expressed satisfaction with their income level. Half of the nonwork group expressed satisfaction.

The degree of expressed satisfaction with level of family income was also considered in terms of three family income levels, Appendix Table 15. Roughly half of the \$1 to \$999 income group, two-thirds of the \$1,000 to \$2,999 group, and four-fifths of the \$3,000 and more income group expressed satisfaction with their family income.

Level of Living

LEVEL-OF-LIVING ACHIEVEMENT. To compare level of living of the various categories of families in the sample population, the homemaker in each household was asked which of 24 items they owned, rented, or "possessed."⁶ About a third of the households had 7 or less of the 24 items, 38 per cent had 8 to 12 items, and 29 per cent had 13 to 24 of the items, Appendix Table 16. In relation to major source of family income, relatively more of the nonwork group were in the lowest level-of-living category (0-7), while more of the farm group were in the medium category (8-12). The nonfarm work group was more evenly distributed among the categories, with some in the highest (13-24) and some in the medium category (8-12). There appeared to be a closer relationship between income level and level of living than between major source of family income and level of living.

LEVEL-OF-LIVING ASPIRATION. To gain some understanding of level of living desired by rural homemakers, they were asked

⁶ The level-of-living items were: automobile, gas or electric range, central heating, piped water, running hot water, electricity, telephone, automatic dishwasher, electric sewing machine, radio, television, mechanical refrigerator, home freezer, washing machine, inside flush toilet, bath or shower, air conditioner, kitchen sink, vacuum cleaner, daily newspaper, weekly newspaper, weekly or biweekly news magazine, farm or trade magazine, and magazine for women.

how they would likely spend an extra \$1,000 for their house or family. Seventy per cent mentioned items in relation to their houses as their first choice, Appendix Table 17. About half mentioned repairing or remodeling the house and installing water systems or baths as their first expenditures.

ASSESSMENT OF LEVEL OF LIVING. Rural homemakers were asked whether their living conditions in comparison to the average of other families in their community were (1) better, (2) about the same, or (3) not as good. About three-fourths stated that their living conditions were about the same as the average of other families in the community, Appendix Table 18. Eighteen per cent said their circumstances were not as good, while 6 per cent indicated that theirs were better. In a rural democratic society, there is a tendency among people to deny real social differences. It appeared to interviewers in this study that some homemakers, whose circumstances obviously were superior, seemed to feel that it was presumptuous to admit it. Humility appeared to be a valued trait among the rural homemakers included in this study.

A second question involved homemaker's assessment of their levels of living. They were asked, "Do you have to go without things you really need because you don't have enough money?" Forty per cent indicated that they were not denied items they considered as necessities, Appendix Table 19. In terms of major source of family income, the proportions indicating that they had to do without things they really needed varied from approximately a fourth of the farm group to just under two-thirds of the nonwork group. The nonfarm work group was intermediate with about a third expressing this feeling of deprivation.

Community Participation

ACHIEVEMENT IN COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION. In terms of community participation, the typical rural resident of Fayette County, Alabama, appeared to be active in religious organizations only, Appendix Table 20. Fifty-eight per cent of all respondents reported active membership in religious organizations. Only 16 per cent claimed active membership in secular organizations. Approximately a fourth of all the heads and homemakers of the rural families in the sample either did not belong to organizations or were inactive members.

ASPIRATIONS IN AND ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION. When rural homemakers were asked if they thought they should take part in more community organizations, 78 per cent said "No." There was a slightly greater tendency for those receiving their major source of family income from nonfarm sources to say that they should be more active in organizations. Twenty-four per cent of this group as compared with approximately 13 per cent of both the farm and nonwork groups, replied "Yes" to this question.

The rural homemakers who said that they should take part in more community organizations were asked to name organizations to which they should belong. Half indicated that they should belong to a church. Other organizations named (in order by number of times mentioned) were local PTA, home demonstration club, community club, and Farm Bureau.

Responses from the sample population indicate a low level of community participation by the rural population and a low degree of aspiration to become more active. However, the growing nonfarm work segment indicated a greater feeling of responsibility toward joining community organizations. This tendency was in keeping with the pattern long observed in American society. As industrialization, urbanization, mobility, and the division of labor increase, the older informal patterns of group interaction tend to decline. However, the need for intimate association and group support is not correspondingly lessened, and the void is, in part, replaced by various formal special-interest organizations.

CONSEQUENCES of DEGREE of SOCIAL and ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT

As the rural people of Fayette County, Alabama, have attempted to achieve their aspirations or goals, they have met with varying degrees of success. In preceding sections of this report, the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of various segments of the sample with achievements in four areas — occupation, income, level of living, and social participation — have been discussed.

There are cumulative consequences of overall achievement of a population's total aspirations. Lack of achievement can result in a feeling of despair and uncertainty. Readiness or willingness

of a person to change occupation or residence may, in whole or in part, result from lack of adjustment or achievement, as well as from changing aspirations. To determine some of the cumulative results of the total achievement or adjustive processes of rural people in the study area, the following measures were used: (1) readiness to change occupation, (2) readiness to change residence, and (3) despair and uncertainty.

Readiness to Change Occupation

Although approximately three-fourths of the heads of rural households said that they preferred the work they were already in, about half indicated that they would "take at once" a factory job at twice their present incomes, Appendix Tables 5 and 12. A third said that they would consider such an offer and decide later. Eighteen per cent said that they would refuse the offer.

The difference between preference for present work and willingness to change for a greater income was greatest for the farm group. Whereas, 80 per cent of those receiving their major source of family income from the farm said that they preferred their present employment, approximately half would take the job if offered, and about a third said that they would consider such an offer. This apparent general preference for present jobs and a willingness to accept or consider other work at increased pay indicated not so much a dislike for the nature of work itself but a desire for greater rewards. These two responses from the heads of rural households were indications of a high degree of readiness to change occupations if they could be assured of a higher income.

Readiness to Change Residence

All of the heads of rural households and rural homemakers were asked if they would like to move from their present residences. Eighty-three per cent of the total said that they did not desire to move, Appendix Table 21. For the 15 per cent of rural heads and rural homemakers who would like to move, it is assumed that their stated desires to move grew out of their assessments of their total situation. The situation was hypothetically altered by asking the heads of rural households if "having to leave their community in order to accept work returning 50 per cent more income" would stop them. Forty-one per cent said that this

condition would not stop them, Appendix Table 14. In the occupation-income motivation complex, there appeared to be a preference for present work, but for many there was evidently stronger motivation for more income. Over 80 per cent of the rural heads and homemakers in Fayette County preferred their present rural residences but only 59 per cent indicated that they would not leave their rural communities for 50 per cent more income.

The heads of rural households and rural homemakers who desired to move were asked to give their main reasons for wanting to change residence. The responses of approximately 37 per cent of the group indicated aspirations toward a higher level of living, Appendix Table 22. Of this 37 per cent, some wanted to move in order to live in a new or better house, while others desired to be closer to services and/or facilities. About a third of the respondents who wished to move gave reasons associated with improving their work situation. These were equally divided between those desiring to move to employment or better employment and those wishing to be closer to their present work. Respondents who did not desire to change residences were asked why they did not wish to move. This question did not elicit specific responses. Only 6 per cent gave specific replies such as age, health, or lack of security in moving. The vast majority gave such general responses as "this is home" or "we just like it here."

Of the heads of rural households and rural homemakers who desired to move, slightly more than a third did not wish to move beyond the county, and 57 per cent no farther than adjacent counties, Appendix Table 23. Only about 14 per cent desired to move beyond adjacent counties. The remaining 29 per cent were undecided.

The rural heads and rural homemakers who desired to change residences were also asked to state their preferences of types of residences — rural farm, rural nonfarm, and urban. The largest proportion (31 per cent) said that they would prefer to move to a small town of less than 2,500 population, Appendix Table 24. Almost as many expressed preferences for rural nonfarm residences and residences in towns or cities above 2,500 population. Slightly less than a fourth named each of these types and about 10 per cent said they preferred to move to a farm residence.

The heads of rural households in the three "major source of

family income" groups were asked if they actually planned to move within the next 5 years. Only 11 per cent said that they did, and most of these were in the nonfarm work group. An additional 6 per cent said they were undecided about actually moving. The remaining 83 per cent did not plan to move within the next 5 years.

Despair and Uncertainty

There were indications that a relatively large number of the rural people of Fayette County, Alabama, had achieved considerably less than their aspirations, especially in the areas of income and level of living. Supporting this conclusion were the statements by 40 per cent of the rural homemakers that they had to do without necessities because of lack of income. A further indication of low-income achievement was the expressed preference of heads of rural households for their present kind of work and their present residences on one hand and the willingness of a large proportion to accept other work and to leave their homes and communities for additional income, on the other. Changes have also taken place in the occupational structure of the rural population. It was hypothesized that the lack of access to the means for achieving life's goals and the rapid rate of occupational and associated social changes had produced a high rate of *despair* and *uncertainty*. To test this hypothesis, Srole's Anomia Scale⁷ plus one additional question was used. Each head of a rural household and rural homemaker was asked if he or she agreed or disagreed with six given statements. Since there was such high agreement between rural heads and rural homemakers, only the responses of the heads are reported. Appendix Table 25 indicates the proportion of heads of rural households who agreed with these statements, as well as the proportion agreeing in each of the "major source of family income" groups — farm, nonfarm work, and nonwork.

The first statement, "These days, a person does not really know whom he can count on," was designed to measure "the individual's perception that his framework of immediate personal relationships, the very rock of his social existence, was no longer

⁷ Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," *American Sociological Review*, XXI (December, 1956), pp. 709-716; Dorothy L. Meier and Wendell Bell, "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life's Goals," *American Sociological Review*, XXIV (April, 1959), pp. 189-202.

predictive or supportive." This statement evoked the highest proportion of agreement of any of the six statements given. Seventy-nine per cent of the heads of rural households agreed that they did not really know whom they could depend on. Of the three "major source of family income" groups, the greatest proportion expressing agreement was in the oldest and lowest income group — the nonwork group. The next highest agreement was expressed by the farm group and the lowest agreement was expressed by the younger, higher income, nonfarm work group.

The statement that induced the second strongest agreement was, "There is little use writing to public officials because often they are not really interested in the problems of the average man." Sixty-seven per cent agreed with this statement that was constructed to measure "the individual's sense that community leaders are detached from and indifferent to his needs." As in the case of the first statement, the strength of agreement by the "major source of family income" groups, from highest to lowest, were the nonwork group, the farm group, and the nonfarm work group.

The next statement, in terms of the proportion of heads of rural households agreeing, was "Nowadays, a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself." Agreement with this statement indicates "the individual's perception of the social order as essentially fickle and unpredictable." Sixty-four per cent of the nonwork group agreed, as compared with 52 per cent of both the farm and nonfarm work group.

Indicative of the high degree of pessimism among respondents about the future was the agreement of 49 per cent of the rural heads that "it is hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future." Agreement with this statement was designed to measure "the deflation or loss of internalized social norms and values, reflected in the extreme form in the individual's sense of the meaninglessness of life itself." The order of the proportion of heads agreeing with this statement was the same as for the first two statements. Roughly two-thirds of the nonwork group, half of the farm group, and a third of the nonfarm work group supported this statement.

Forty-eight per cent of the heads of rural households agreed with the statement, "In spite of what some people say, the lot

of the average man is getting worse." This statement was supposed to measure "the individual's view, beyond abdication of future life goals, that he and people like him are retrogressing from the goals they have already reached." In this case, the farm group was in slightly greater agreement with the statement than was the nonwork group. Approximately three-fifths of the farm and nonwork groups supported the statement, but only about a third of the nonfarm work group agreed.

In these five statements, respondents were asked to assess the social situations in which they lived. The implications for their own situations, their own adjustments, and their own inadequacies were more or less indirect. However, the sixth and final statement was more direct and considered a greater threat to the ego-involvement of respondents. This statement was an attempt to get the interviewees to look back over the sum total of all of their achievements and failures and agree or disagree with the following statement: "Things have usually gone against me in life." In spite of the threatening nature of the question that, in part, asked for an admission of personal inadequacy to cope with life's situations, 26 per cent of the interviewed heads of rural households agreed with the statement. Again, the largest proportion in agreement was the nonwork group, followed by the farm group and the nonfarm work group.

Each head of a rural household was given a "despair and uncertainty" score, as indicated in the footnote to Appendix Table 25. The last item in this table indicates the proportion of the rural heads who rated high in despair and uncertainty. Approximately half rated high in this overall measure of despair and uncertainty. Sixty per cent of the nonwork group, 58 per cent of the farm group, and 42 per cent of the nonfarm work group rated high.

The rapid changes that have taken place in Fayette County, Alabama, during recent years — the increasing comparative disadvantages for those in farming, the increasing ability for low-income families to compare their lot with others, and the general aging of the population in the area — appear to have resulted in a relatively high degree of despair and uncertainty. This was especially true among the nonwork and farm groups. In addition to this high degree of despair and uncertainty, a lack of community attachment or responsibility was indicated by the low rate of membership and activity in formal organizations re-

ported, along with the small proportion who felt a responsibility toward greater community participation.⁸

Research has shown that agricultural programs have been least effective in establishing communication at the lower socio-economic levels. It is suggested that the apathy and inability of those suffering from despair and uncertainty have been largely responsible for low participation of the low-income groups in various educational programs.

MECHANISMS of ADJUSTMENT

Technological advances, increased productivity, improved transportation, and increased communication, among other changes, have not only changed the economic and social situation for the rural citizens of Fayette County, Alabama, but these advances have also changed their aspirations. Changes in any part of a social system normally produce compensating adjustments in other parts of the system. People involved in a changing social system are generally faced with certain psychological stresses until they have made personal and family adjustments to their new situations. Many of the rural people of Fayette County have been willing and able to adjust to changing situations and to their changing sense of values. Others have been either unable or unwilling to adjust, as indicated by their relatively high degree of despair and uncertainty. Some of the mechanisms or ways by which rural people may adjust to changes in the social system are migration, change in occupation, employment of the homemaker, change of residence, and welfare or other nonwork income.

Migration

A common method of adjustment by many rural people, particularly those engaged in agriculture, has been to move to other areas and accept other types of employment. The declining total population and the more rapidly declining rural population indicate that Fayette County has been no exception to this general type of adjustment.

⁸ This high degree of despair and uncertainty appears to give rise to what has been described as "the breakdown of the individual's sense of attachment to society." See: Robert M. MacIver, *The Ramparts We Guard* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950), pp. 84-92.

Although the procedures used in this study did not lend themselves to determining the out-migration of families, they did aid in determining the extent of out-migration of the children of respondents.

The rural homemakers in the sample indicated that of their children who had migrated from their homes, Appendix Table 26, only 17 per cent had remained in the immediate community and 37 per cent somewhere in the county. Thirty-six per cent had migrated beyond the county but had remained in the State. Of these, half were residing in adjacent counties. More than a fourth of the migrating children had moved outside the State.

Occupational Mobility

Another avenue through which adjustments have been made to the changing economic situation and the changing goals or values of people has been occupational mobility.

Of the heads of rural households interviewed, a third indicated no change in work status since their first full-time employment, Appendix Table 27. The greatest occupational mobility took place in the shift from farm to nonfarm work. Twenty-three per cent of the total number of rural heads reported this type of change as their last change in work status, but this was partially offset by a shift of 9 per cent from nonfarm work to farming. Seventeen per cent reported shifting from farming to nonwork. Of the total, 46 per cent had changed in part or completely from farming in their last change of work status. On the other hand, 15 per cent reported their last shift in work status to be from nonfarm work to farming or part-time farming.

Homemaker's Employment

Another way by which families in many areas have sought to increase their income and level of living has been by the employment of homemakers. Of the rural homemakers studied who were less than 65 years of age and not disabled, 75 per cent had not been employed outside of the home in 1955 nor in 1959, Appendix Table 28. Twelve per cent reported employment during both years and 10 per cent had jobs in 1959 but not in 1955. This was offset by 3 per cent who reported employment in 1955 but not in 1959. Thus, there was a 7 per cent gain in out-of-the-home employment of rural homemakers during this 5-year period. The 22 per cent of applicable rural homemakers

who reported employment in 1959 were largely from families whose main source of income was nonfarm work.

Residential Mobility

Residential mobility is often used as a means by which people seek to achieve their aspirations in income, occupation, and other areas. Sixty-six per cent of the responding heads of rural households indicated that their families had not migrated across county or state boundaries, Appendix Table 29. Forty-five per cent of the farm group and 40 per cent of the nonwork group reported one or more moves. Only 26 per cent of the nonfarm group reported such moves.

Welfare and Other Nonwork Income

Approximately 40 per cent of the rural families in the sample reported some income from nonwork sources. Thirty per cent reported nonwork sources as their major source of family income (more than 50 per cent). Of these families, 47 per cent received their major support from State welfare programs, Appendix Table 30, largely old-age pensions. Only 4 per cent of the respondents reported aid from family members, such as married children, as their major source of nonwork income. This was an indication of the shifting of responsibility for the care of the aged from family to State. Replies from respondents indicated that this shift was usually accompanied with considerable emotional stress.

Thirty-five per cent of the families subsisting mainly on nonwork sources reported retirement income as their major support. These sources included Social Security retirement, private policy retirement, and insurance beneficiary payments. Eight per cent were mainly supported by veterans' pensions. The remaining 10 per cent reported miscellaneous sources of income, such as support from family members, gifts, and income from stocks.

Educational Mobility

Education has long been considered as a basic channel for upward socio-economic mobility. The Census of Population indicates only a slight upgrading in education in Fayette County, Alabama, from 1940 to 1950. The median grade completed by those 25 years of age and older rose from 7.2 in 1940 to 7.6 in 1950 for the county as a whole. For the same age group in the

rural population, the median grade rose from 7.1 to 7.3 during the same period. However, the Census reported the median years completed for the rural nonfarm group as 7.9 for both 1940 and 1950.

These levels of education in Fayette County were considerably below the United States median of 9.3 grades completed. Also, the gains made from 1940 to 1950 in the county did not keep pace with the national gain of 0.9 grade. This may have resulted, in part, from the out-migration of many of the younger, better educated people.

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

Summary

THE FOCUS OF THE STUDY. This study was designed to gain an understanding of the social and economic adjustments of rural families in a low-income area of Alabama. In the study, social and economic behavior was considered an adjustive process whereby individuals adjusted (1) in specific situations, (2) to their own desires, capabilities, and attitudes, and (3) to the expectations of the social groups to which they belonged. The four kinds of social and economic adjustments studied were: (1) occupation, (2) income, (3) level of living, and (4) community participation. Each of these kinds of adjustments was examined in terms of (1) objective achievement, (2) aspirations, (3) obstacles to achievement, and (4) satisfaction. In addition, more general consequences of overall achievements were considered as well as certain mechanisms of adjustment.

THE SAMPLE. The sample population of 171 households in Fayette County, Alabama, were all rural and almost all white, with about two out of three in the nonfarm residential category. Average age of heads of these rural households was 50 years, and their educational level averaged 7.5 grades. Average size of households was 3.3 persons. Approximately a third of the heads of rural households were engaged in farming, largely small owner-operators.

OCCUPATION. Of the heads of rural households in the sample, 33 per cent reported their main occupation to be farming and 44 per cent had nonfarm occupations. The largest proportion of

nonfarm workers were semi-skilled workers. The remaining 23 per cent of the rural heads were retired, disabled, or unemployed. Only 27 per cent of rural homemakers were employed. These were largely from families whose major sources of family income were nonfarm work, and the majority were employed in textile plants.

Major sources of family income (more than half) reported by the sample families were: 18 per cent farm, 51 per cent nonfarm work, and 30 per cent nonwork sources. Approximately a third of the families received their income from two or three of these three basic sources.

Sixty-five per cent of the heads of rural households indicated that they preferred the type of work that they were already engaged in, and 69 per cent expected to be engaged in the same work 5 years in the future.

The rural heads who felt that they would not be able to achieve their occupational aspirations within 5 years gave age, health, expected low income, lack of job opportunities, lack of capital or land, and lack of training as the main obstacles to their aspirations.

Although 95 per cent of the employed rural heads expressed a general liking for their work, practically all of this group offered a specific dislike. The most common complaint was low financial rewards for work.

INCOME LEVEL OF FAMILY. Family income level of the sample population was low. The median family income reported for 1959 was \$1,676. On the basis of "major source of family income," 78 per cent of the farm families and 94 per cent of the nonwork families reported less than \$2,000 family income in 1959. On the other hand, 80 per cent of the nonfarm work families reported family incomes of \$2,000 or more.

The majority of the heads of rural households expressed a preference for jobs with regular hours and regular pay. However, those whose family incomes were \$3,000 or more showed the greatest tendency in this direction.

In spite of a general liking and preference for the work that they were already engaged in, a majority of the "applicable" heads of rural households would accept a job in a factory at double their present income. Less than a fifth said they would refuse such an offer. Roughly 40 per cent of the total indicated

a willingness to leave their homes and communities to accept work paying 50 per cent more than they were making.

For the respondents whose major source of family income was farming, the chief obstacles to a satisfactory income (in 1959) were poor farm cost-price relationships, a poor crop year, and age or health. Obstacles most often mentioned by the nonfarm work families were lack of jobs, age or health, and low wage scales in the area. Of the five conditions *least likely* to stop the heads of rural households from accepting other work returning 50 per cent more income, four of the conditions largely involved community bonds and relationships. On the other hand, the six conditions that respondents said were *most likely* to prevent acceptance of better paying employment largely involved the nature of their work and its relationship to workers and their families.

Roughly half of the \$1 to \$999 income group, two-thirds of the \$1,000 to \$2,999 income group, and four-fifths of the \$3,000 or more income group expressed satisfaction with their family incomes.

LEVEL OF LIVING. Thirty-three per cent of the total number of families interviewed had 7 or less of 24 selected level-of-living items, 38 per cent 8 to 12 items, and 29 per cent had 13 to 24 of these items.

Regarding rural homemakers' aspirations toward levels of living, the areas of greatest concern appeared to be repairing or remodeling their houses and the installation of water systems and/or bathrooms.

Although more than three-fourths of the rural homemakers considered their living conditions about the same as that of other families in the community, 40 per cent said they had to go without things they really needed because of lack of income.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION. Responses indicated a low level of formal community participation of rural respondents and a low degree of aspiration to become more active. The majority of the rural heads and rural homemakers studied reported active membership in churches only, and over three-fourths did not believe they should belong to other organizations. However, the growing nonfarm population indicated a greater feeling of responsibility toward belonging to more formal organizations.

GENERAL CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT. Although a large majority of the heads of rural households expressed a preference for and a general satisfaction with their present work, about half of the applicable rural heads indicated that they would "take at once" a factory job at twice their present incomes. Approximately a third said that they would think over such an offer and decide later. The discrepancy between preference for present work and willingness to change for greater income was greatest for the farm group.

Over four-fifths of the respondents did not desire to move from their present residences. However, 41 per cent said that having to leave their community would not stop them from accepting an offer of 50 per cent more income.

Of the heads of rural households and rural homemakers who expressed a desire to move, only 14 per cent wished to move beyond adjacent counties. These respondents expressed a greater preference to move to small towns of less than 2,500 population and least preference to move to farm residences. Concerning the type of residence preferred, a slight majority of the rural heads and rural homemakers of the farm group who desired to move preferred another farm residence. The older nonwork group who wished to move preferred residences in small towns and cities, and the nonfarm work group showed a tendency to prefer rural nonfarm and small town residences.

The rapid rate of occupational, economic, and associated social changes in Fayette County, together with the comparative lack of access to the means of achieving life's goals, appeared to have resulted in a high rate of despair and uncertainty among the rural population. This was especially true among the older nonwork group and the farm group. Almost 60 per cent of the families whose major source of family income was from farming and nonwork sources had relatively high scores on an adapted Srole scale which included six "pessimistic" statements. Forty-two per cent of the nonfarm work group rated high on the same scale.

MECHANISMS OF ADJUSTMENT. Changes in any part of a social system produce compensating adjustments in other parts of the system. Some of the mechanisms by which the rural population of Fayette County have attempted to adjust have been: (1) Eighty-three per cent of the respondents' children who had left

their parents' homes had migrated beyond the immediate community, and 63 per cent beyond the county. (2) Forty-six per cent of the total number of heads of rural households reported changing their occupations in part or completely from farming. This was in part offset by the 15 per cent who reported their last change in work status to be from nonfarm work to farming or part-time farming. (3) Twenty-two per cent of the rural homemakers reported out-of-home employment in 1959. This was a gain of 7 per cent since 1955. (4) About a third of the families had moved across county and/or state lines. (5) Approximately 40 per cent of the families reported some income from nonwork sources, and 30 per cent received the major part of their family income from such sources. Of this latter group, 48 per cent received their major support from State welfare programs, while only 4 per cent received their major support from members of their families. (6) The Census of Population showed only a slight upgrading of education in Fayette County from 1940 to 1950. The median grade completed for persons 25 years of age and over in 1950 was 7.6, as compared with 9.3 for the United States as a whole. (7) Considerable adjustments have taken place in agriculture in the county. Among these have been decreases in the amount of farm land, number of farms, proportion of small commercial farms, proportion of farm income from crops, and proportion of farms operated by tenants. On the other hand, there have been increases in size of farms, proportion of large commercial farms, proportion of farms operated by owners, number of residential farms, number of tractors, and the proportion of farm income from livestock and livestock products.

Conclusions

Two questions were asked in the introduction of this report — "Is the concentration of low-income rural people in Fayette County and other areas of the South a problem to American society?" and "Is this low-income situation generally a problem to the people involved?"

The first question can be answered affirmatively in terms of the general American value system. The American *ideal* of equality of opportunity for each person to (1) make his own occupational choice, (2) receive, at least, a minimum income, (3) have a minimum standard of living, and (4) participate democratically in the affairs of his community, is a real value

in American society. Also, an awareness of the under-utilization of human resources in a period of international competition and conflict makes low production and low-income concentration a societal problem. This societal problem involves not only the greater national society but also the local communities and their basic institutions that may suffer from lack of local support.

Concerning the second question, it is apparent that low incomes and low levels of living were perceived as problems by a significant proportion of the rural population of Fayette County. This is borne out by the relatively high scores on the despair and uncertainty scale; the widespread willingness of respondents to leave their chosen occupations, communities, friends, and homes to accept better paying employment; and the numerous "unasked for" complaints made by respondents.

Since the low-income and low level-of-living conditions of the county appear to be a general societal, community, and individual problem, it appears that many adjustment trends already in process should be facilitated. These helpful changes include shifts in occupation, migration, adjustments in farming programs, establishment of local industrial plants, welfare aid to the aged and disabled, and employment of other members of the family where homemaking duties are not seriously impaired. However, it is recognized that, in the short-run, what seems to be the best adjustment for the individual or family may not appear in the best interests of the community. Many respondents indicated that they wanted their children to find better opportunities but they were distressed to see their youth leave the community. A high rate of out-migration may result in declining school enrollment, church membership, and local sales. However, adjustments in one part of the social system usually necessitate adjustments in other parts. Community institutions will not be exempt from the necessity of adjusting to changing social and economic conditions. Educational, agricultural, and other service organizations are not ends in themselves but should serve the needs of people. Representatives of such agencies or organizations are in a position to help farmers and rural youth make the transition to part-time farming, nonfarm employment, and, if necessary, to nonrural residences.

The rural people of Fayette County have been making adjustments, but many families are not making the fullest use of two basic channels of upward socio-economic mobility characteristic

of a democratic society — educational advancement and social participation. Educational mobility, both general and vocational, is generally a prerequisite for upward occupational mobility, and organized social participation is a basic democratic channel by which democratic institutional adjustment takes place. The big problem is to establish communication with the lower socioeconomic groups who appear to have become, in part, detached from society through apathy resulting from what has been described as despair and uncertainty. This, in turn, appears to have been largely the result of rapid changes and the lack of access, during recent years, to the means of achieving life's aspirations by a large segment of the rural population of Fayette County, Alabama.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TABLE 1. CHANGES AND TRENDS IN AGRICULTURE AND RELATED DATA, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1950 TO 1960¹

Item	1950	1955	1960	Change from 1950 to 1960 Pct.
Total population, number.....	19,388	17,768	16,148	-16.7
Rural population, number.....	15,681	13,801	11,921	-24.0
Farm population, number.....	11,612	8,983 ²	5,762 ²	-49.6
Total land area, acres.....	401,280	401,280	401,280	0
Land in farms, acres.....	255,153	233,767	190,787	-25.2
Total cropland, acres.....	87,996	62,790	50,798	-42.3
Cropland harvested, acres.....	59,958	47,582	34,430	-42.6
Total land pastured, acres.....	50,755	52,259	36,301	-28.5
Total farm woodland, acres.....	144,696	149,915	122,422	-15.4
Number of farms, number.....	2,579	2,089	1,340	-48.0
Nonwhite operators, number.....	261	209	138	-47.1
All tenants, number.....	863	584	288	-66.6
Average farm size, acres.....	98.9	111.9	142.4	+44.0
Types of farms				
Commercial farms, number.....	1,416	778	554	-60.9
Part-time farms, number.....	481	333	771	+60.3
Residential farms, number.....	676	815	NR ³	NR
Farmers who do some work off farms, number.....	989	1,017	691	-30.1
Farmers who work off farms 100 days or more per year, number..	481	535	421	-12.5
Cropland use				
Cotton, acres.....	18,032	9,898	7,329	-59.4
Corn, acres.....	34,179	31,291	23,548	-31.1
All hay, acres.....	4,457	3,564	1,594	-64.2
Vegetables for sale, acres.....	986	717	407	-58.7
Orchards, acres.....	506	227	153	-69.8
Farms reporting tractors, number.....	368	461	550	+49.5
Fertilizer used on farms, tons ⁴	NR	7,298	6,076	NR

(Continued)

APPENDIX TABLE 1 (Continued). CHANGES AND TRENDS IN AGRICULTURE AND RELATED DATA, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1950 TO 1960¹

Item	1950	1955	1960	Change from 1950 to 1960 Pct.
Farms reporting				
Farm trucks, number.....	563	571	656	+16.5
Automobiles, number.....	738	815	727	- 1.5
Electricity, number.....	2,030	1,841	NR	NR
Telephones, number.....	185	190	333	+80.0
Running water, number.....	NR	594	NR	NR
Television, number.....	NR	382	NR	NR
Livestock on farms				
Horses and mules, number.....	3,659	2,048	1,134	-69.0
All cattle, number.....	6,758	9,384	7,497	+10.9
Milk cows, number.....	3,080	2,814	2,039	-33.8
All hogs and pigs, number.....	6,007	6,058	6,311	+ 5.1
All chickens, number.....	74,792	84,680	105,693	+41.3
Chickens sold, number.....	66,099 ⁵	18,865	51,891	-21.5
Broilers sold, number.....	NR	357,860	757,900	NR
Commercial farms by economic class				
A. \$10,000 and over gross income, number.....	14	17	34	+142.9
B. \$5,000-9,999, number.....	5	18	69	+1280.0
C. \$2,500-4,999, number.....	62	47	101	+62.9
D. \$ 50-2,499 ⁶ , number.....	1,335	696	350	-73.8

¹ Based on U.S. Census of Agriculture.² Estimated by Department of Agricultural Economics, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.³ Not reported.⁴ Includes liquid materials in 1959.⁵ All chickens sold, including broilers.⁶ For 1950 and 1955, includes gross incomes from \$250 to \$2,499. For 1960, includes gross income from \$50 to \$2,499.

APPENDIX TABLE 2. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 171 RURAL FAMILIES INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE INTERVIEWED IN FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Characteristic	Fayette County sample
Type residence	
Rural farm, per cent.....	39
Rural nonfarm, per cent.....	61
Racial composition	
White, per cent.....	96
Nonwhite, per cent.....	4
Sex of head of household	
Male, per cent.....	91
Female, per cent.....	9
Age of head	
39 and under, per cent.....	25
40-49, per cent.....	23
50-64, per cent.....	29
65 and over, per cent.....	23
Availability of head for work	
Fully able, per cent.....	64
Limited permanent disability, per cent.....	11
Permanent disability, per cent.....	25
Tenure of 64 farmers	
Owner or part owner, per cent.....	83
Tenants and sharecroppers, per cent.....	17
Size of households, average number.....	3.3
Age of head, average years.....	51
Highest grade completed by head, average years.....	7.4
Highest grade completed by homemaker, average years.....	8.0

APPENDIX TABLE 3. MAIN OCCUPATION OR WORK STATUS OF HEADS AND HOMEMAKERS OF 171 SURVEYED RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Main occupation or work status	Respondents reporting			
	Head of household		Homemaker	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farm operator or manager.....	51	29	4	2
Operatives or kindred workers.....	31	17	27	16
Craftsman, foreman, or kindred workers.....	15	9	0	0
Laborer except farm.....	12	7	2	1
Sales, clerical, or kindred; service except household.....	8	5	0	0
Manager, official, or proprietor except farm; professional, technical, or kindred workers.....	8	5	4	2
Homemaker.....	8	5	130	76
Farm laborer, sharecropper, or foreman.....	5	3	1	1
Private household workers.....	1	1	2	1
Disabled.....	16	9	1	1
Retired.....	15	9	0	0
Unemployed (looking for work).....	1	1	0	0
TOTAL.....	171	100	171	100

APPENDIX TABLE 4. MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME (50 PER CENT OR MORE), 171 SURVEYED RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Source of income	Respondents reporting	
	No.	Pct.
Nonfarm work.....	87	51
Nonwork.....	52	30
Farm.....	31	18
TOTAL.....	171	100

APPENDIX TABLE 5. PROPORTION OF 128 HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS EXPRESSING SPECIFIED WORK PREFERENCES, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Kind of work liked by head of household	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Same as already doing.....	80	60	57	65
Change types of nonfarm work.....	0	17	0	11
Change from farming to nonfarm work.....	17	4	29	9
Change from nonfarm work to farming.....	0	12	7	9
Change from part-time farming to farming.....	3	5	0	4
Don't know.....	0	2	7	2
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	30	84	14	128

APPENDIX TABLE 6. PROPORTION OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIED WORK EXPECTATIONS IN FIVE YEARS, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Kind of work expected in 5 years	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Same as present and same as aspiration.....	83	65	67	69
Same as present but different from aspiration.....	17	18	17	18
Different from present but same as aspiration.....	0	11	8	8
Different from present and different from aspiration.....	0	1	0	1
Not ascertained.....	0	5	8	4
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	29	79	12	120

APPENDIX TABLE 7. PERCEIVED OBSTACLES TO OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Obstacles to work aspirations	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Age and/or health.....	80	29	50	40
Low expected farm income or salary.....	0	21	0	15
Lack of job opportunities.....	20	17	0	15
Lack of capital or land.....	0	17	25	15
Lack of training.....	0	12	25	12
Would have to be away from family.....	0	4	0	3
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	5	24	4	33

APPENDIX TABLE 8. DISLIKES EXPRESSED BY HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS FOR THEIR PRESENT WORK, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Things most disliked	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Low income or cost-price relationship.....	84	41	57	53
Physical nature of work.....	13	15	29	16
Distance to work.....	0	15	7	11
Interpersonal relations.....	3	8	0	6
Hours too long.....	0	10	0	6
Irregular employment.....	0	1	0	1
Too much responsibility.....	0	1	0	1
Nothing.....	0	1	7	1
No reply.....	0	8	0	5
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	85	14	130

APPENDIX TABLE 9. REPORTED NET CASH INCOME LEVEL OF RURAL FAMILIES, BY THE MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Income level of family	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
\$ 1-\$ 499.....	30	1	10	9
\$ 500-\$ 999.....	16	7	44	20
\$1,000-\$1,999.....	32	12	40	24
\$2,000-\$2,999.....	6	24	4	15
\$3,000-\$4,999.....	13	38	2	22
\$5,000 and more.....	3	18	0	10
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

APPENDIX TABLE 10. JOB PREFERENCE OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF HOURS AND AMOUNT OF PAY, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Job preference	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Regular hours and regular pay.....	78	73	59	70
Longer hours and more pay.....	16	25	35	27
Shorter hours and less pay.....	3	2	4	2
Don't know.....	3	0	2	1
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

APPENDIX TABLE 11. JOB PREFERENCE OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF HOURS AND AMOUNT OF PAY, BY FAMILY INCOME LEVEL, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Job preference	Family income level			Total
	\$1-999	\$1,000-2,999	\$3,000 and more	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Regular hours and regular pay.....	66	64	80	70
Longer hours and more pay.....	30	32	18	27
Shorter hours and less pay.....	2	3	2	2
Don't know.....	2	1	0	1
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	50	66	55	171

APPENDIX TABLE 12. REACTION OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS TO AN OFFER OF DOUBLE INCOME AT A FACTORY JOB, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME¹, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Reaction to offer of double pay	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Take it at once.....	48	50	64	51
Think it over and decide later.....	35	34	7	31
Refuse it.....	17	16	29	18
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	29	70	14	113

¹ Heads of households who were retired, disabled, or employed as professionals or factory workers were excluded.

APPENDIX TABLE 13. MAIN OBSTACLES TO ACHIEVEMENT OF INCOME ASPIRATIONS
AS EXPRESSED BY RURAL HEADS AND HOMEMAKERS, BY MAJOR SOURCE
OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Obstacles	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Age and/or health.....	11	26	51	35
Lack of jobs.....	6	34	4	16
Low farm prices and/or high farm costs.....	49	4	6	12
Inadequate pensions or retirement.....	0	0	23	11
High costs of living.....	0	8	6	6
Lack of training.....	0	6	4	4
Low wage scale.....	0	10	0	4
Irregular employment.....	0	8	0	3
Poor crop year.....	22	0	0	3
Wants too large.....	6	4	0	2
Lack of capital and/or land.....	6	0	2	2
No husband to help.....	0	0	4	2
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	18	50	54	122

APPENDIX TABLE 14. SPECIFIED RURAL CONDITIONS WHICH APPEARED TO BE
ATTITUDINAL OBSTACLES TO HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS TO IMPROVING
THEIR INCOMES, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME,
FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Specified conditions	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Health would be endangered.....	96	98	100	98
Have to leave family for some time.....	93	86	78	86
Have to move around the county a lot.....	82	82	78	82
Have to work harder.....	78	70	56	71
Have to work at night.....	67	61	67	63
Have to take on more responsibility.....	67	59	56	60
Have to leave your community.....	74	57	33	59
Have to give up your spare time.....	67	59	11	57
Have to keep quiet on religious views.....	70	47	56	53
Have to leave your friends.....	63	51	11	50
Have to keep quiet on political views.....	59	32	33	39
Number of cases.....	27	83	9	119

APPENDIX TABLE 15. DEGREE OF SATISFACTION EXPRESSED BY HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS FOR FAMILY INCOME, BY LEVEL OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Degree of satisfaction	Family income level			Total
	\$1-999	\$1,000-2,999	\$3,000 and more	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Very satisfactory.....	0	0	4	1
Satisfactory.....	48	64	80	64
Unsatisfactory.....	52	36	16	35
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	50	66	55	171

APPENDIX TABLE 16. FAMILY LEVEL OF LIVING OF RURAL FAMILIES, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Number of level-of-living items owned, rented, or "possessed"	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Low (0-7).....	26	26	48	33
Medium (8-12).....	48	36	35	38
High (13-24).....	26	38	17	29
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

APPENDIX TABLE 17. HOW RURAL HOMEMAKERS SAID THEY FELT THEY WOULD LIKELY SPEND AN EXTRA \$1,000 FOR THEIR HOUSE OR FAMILY, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

First items mentioned for house or family	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Repair and/or remodel house.....	19	26	30	26
Install water system and/or bath.....	19	17	4	13
Repair or remodel house, including water and/or bath.....	32	8	8	12
Pay on house.....	3	14	8	10
Furnish house (appliances or furniture).....	7	15	2	9
Pay for medical attention.....	7	2	19	8
Buy food and/or clothing.....	3	2	13	6
Save for emergency.....	0	5	8	5
Educate children.....	7	3	2	3
Pay debts.....	0	2	6	3
Invest it.....	3	2	0	2
Buy a car.....	0	2	0	1
Use for recreation.....	0	1	0	1
Don't know.....	0	1	0	1
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

APPENDIX TABLE 18. RURAL HOMEMAKER'S ASSESSMENT OF FAMILY LIVING CONDITIONS IN COMPARISON TO THE AVERAGE OTHER FAMILY IN THEIR COMMUNITY, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Assessment of living conditions	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Better.....	0	10	2	6
About the same.....	81	78	71	76
Not as good.....	19	12	27	18
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

APPENDIX TABLE 19. RURAL HOMEMAKERS WHO REPORTED LACK OF NECESSITIES, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Have to go without things needed	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Yes.....	26	31	64	40
No.....	74	69	36	60
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

APPENDIX TABLE 20. DEGREE OF FORMAL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION OF RURAL HEADS AND RURAL HOMEMAKERS, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Degree of community participation	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
No membership.....	13	22	23	21
Membership but inactive.....	5	1	10	5
Active in religious organizations only.....	64	54	62	58
Active in secular organizations only.....	0	2	0	1
Active in both religious and secular organizations.....	18	21	5	15
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	62	174	104	340

APPENDIX TABLE 21. ASPIRATIONS OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS AND RURAL HOMEMAKERS TOWARD CHANGING RESIDENCE, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Would like to move	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Yes.....	11	18	12	15
No.....	84	81	85	83
Don't know.....	5	1	3	2
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	62	174	104	340

APPENDIX TABLE 22. MAIN REASONS GIVEN BY RURAL HOMEMAKERS AND RURAL HEADS FOR WANTING TO CHANGE RESIDENCES, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Reasons for wanting to move	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
To have a new or better house.....	29	26	8	21
For employment or better employment.....	14	19	15	18
To be closer to work.....	0	26	8	17
To be closer to services and/or facilities.....	29	10	23	16
General positive reasons.....	14	7	22	12
To be near more people.....	0	6	8	6
General negative reasons.....	0	3	8	4
Others.....	14	3	8	6
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	7	31	13	51

APPENDIX TABLE 23. WHERE RURAL HEADS AND RURAL HOMEMAKERS WOULD LIKE TO MOVE, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Where heads and homemakers would like to move	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Another residence in this community.....	29	6	15	12
Another community in this county.....	29	19	31	23
An adjacent county.....	0	29	15	22
Elsewhere in Alabama.....	0	3	0	2
An adjacent state.....	0	7	0	4
Elsewhere in U.S.....	28	7	0	8
Undecided.....	14	29	39	29
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	7	31	13	51

APPENDIX TABLE 24. TYPES OF RESIDENCES THAT RURAL HEADS AND RURAL HOMEMAKERS WOULD LIKE TO MOVE TO, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Type of residence	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Farm.....	58	0	8	10
Rural nonfarm.....	14	32	8	24
Small town (less than 2,500).....	14	32	38	31
Town or city (2,500 or more).....	14	23	31	23
Undecided.....	0	13	15	12
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	7	31	13	51

APPENDIX TABLE 25. PROPORTION OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS AGREEING WITH SELECTED STATEMENTS WHICH EXPRESS DESPAIR AND UNCERTAINTY, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Statement	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
These days, a person does not really know whom he can count on.....	77	75	86	79
There is little use writing to public officials because often they are not really interested in the problems of the average man.....	64	62	77	67
Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.....	52	52	64	55
It is hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.....	52	37	67	49
In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.....	61	37	58	48
Things have usually gone against me in life.....	29	18	36	26
Percentage of heads scoring high on despair and uncertainty scale (scoring 6 or more out of a possible 12) ¹	58	42	60	51
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

¹ Each respondent received a score of 2, 1, or 0 on each of the six questions, depending upon whether he agreed, did not know, or disagreed, respectively. The sum of the respondent's score on the six questions, thus, could range from 0 to 12. Those scoring 6 or more were considered to exhibit a high rate of despair and uncertainty (anomia).

APPENDIX TABLE 26. NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF CHILDREN WHO MIGRATED TO VARIOUS PLACES RELATIVE TO THEIR PARENTS' HOMES, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Place migrated	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
To this community.....	11	11	22	17
To another community in this county.....	24	26	15	20
To adjacent county.....	24	21	14	18
Elsewhere in Alabama.....	14	30	14	18
Adjacent state.....	8	1	6	5
Elsewhere in U.S.....	14	10	26	20
Foreign country.....	0	0	1	¹
Military service.....	5	0	2	2
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	65	80	181	326

¹ Less than 0.5 per cent.

APPENDIX TABLE 27. TYPE OF LAST CHANGE IN WORK STATUS, BY HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Last change in work status	Respondents reporting	
	No.	Pct.
No change.....	57	33
Farm to nonfarm work.....	39	23
Farm to nonwork (disabled and retired).....	30	17
Nonfarm work to farm.....	16	9
Nonfarm work to farm and nonfarm work.....	10	6
Nonfarm work to nonwork.....	8	5
Farm to farm and nonfarm work.....	6	4
Farm and nonfarm to nonfarm work.....	3	2
Farm and nonfarm work to farm.....	2	1
TOTAL.....	171	100

APPENDIX TABLE 28. CHANGE IN RURAL HOMEMAKER'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS FROM 1955 TO 1959, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Change in employment	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Employed in 1959 but not in 1955.....	3	16	3	10
Employed in 1955 but not in 1959.....	0	5	3	3
Employed in 1955 and 1959.....	3	20	3	12
Not employed in 1955 or 1959.....	94	59	91	75
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	80	39	150

APPENDIX TABLE 29. RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF HEADS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS, BY MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Residential mobility	Major source of income			Total
	Farm	Nonfarm work	Nonwork	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
No moves across county or state boundaries.....	55	74	60	66
One or more moves across county and/or state boundaries.....	45	26	40	34
TOTAL.....	100	100	100	100
Number of cases.....	31	87	52	170

APPENDIX TABLE 30. MAJOR SOURCE OF NONWORK INCOME OF THE RURAL FAMILIES WHO REPORTED NONWORK AS THE MAJOR SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME, FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, 1960

Major source of nonwork income	Respondents reporting	
	No.	Pct.
Welfare payments		
State old-age pension or assistance.....	23	43
Aid to dependent children.....	1	2
Aid to permanently disabled.....	1	2
TOTAL.....	25	47
Retirement income		
Social security (retirement).....	16	31
Beneficiary of insurance payments.....	1	2
Retirement benefits (private policy).....	1	2
TOTAL.....	18	35
Veteran's benefits		
Veteran's pension.....	4	8
TOTAL.....	4	8
Miscellaneous		
Money from family members.....	2	4
Gifts of more than \$50.....	2	4
Income from stocks.....	1	2
TOTAL.....	5	10
GRAND TOTAL.....	52	100

APPENDIX B

Guide Lines for Social and Economic Adjustments

For dealing with the overall problems of social and economic adjustments and for the establishment of communication with the lower income groups largely overlooked by many agricultural and educational programs, this and other research studies suggest certain general guide lines for action. These suggested guides derive mainly from the broad area of sociology, but they are supported in part by the findings of this study. Among these general guide lines are the following:

FIRST, it must be recognized that as occupational differentiation continues, the population shifts from a type of solidarity based upon similarity and common interest to a type of solidarity based upon specialization and the division of labor.

SECOND, there are today relatively fewer social strata or classes in rural society than formerly and the extremes in socio-economic levels are greater in urban areas than in rural areas. As occupational differentiation continues, therefore, it appears likely that the range and complexity of the social classes will also increase.

THIRD, there exists in low-income rural areas a high degree of what has been described as despair and uncertainty. These states of mind have led a significant proportion of the population to a state of apathy and a lack of confidence in their ability to solve their own problems.

FOURTH, the low-income groups in their semi-isolated social position are normally unaccustomed to formal organizations since most of their social interaction in the past has been based upon informal kinship and friendship circles.

FIFTH, if agricultural and other agencies expect to maintain their prestige and the appreciation of rural people, they must deal more realistically with the *real* and often highly specialized problems of rural people.

SIXTH, it should be recognized that people have many problems that are not economic in nature and that many people, especially the aged, may have few agricultural or occupational problems. It can be assumed, however, that practically all people have desires to be looked up to or respected, to engage in satisfying social relationships, and to feel secure economically, socially, and psychologically.

FINALLY, it is suggested that the solution of the varied problems of the increasingly differentiated rural people should be based upon both "general" and "specialized" talents of closely coordinated workers who offer not one program or approach but a series of programs to the various occupational-income groups within an area.